

COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

August 13, 2001

5:30 PM

Chairman O'Neil called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen O'Neil, Cashin, Lopez

Absent: Aldermen Wihby, Clancy

Messrs: Chief Kane, R. Robidas, D. Clay, S. Maranto

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Resolutions:

"Amending the 2001 and 2002 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Sixty Five Thousand Three Hundred and Two Dollars (\$65,302.00) for certain Health Projects."

"Amending the 2002 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Sixty Nine Thousand Eight Hundred and Twenty Six Dollars (\$69,826.00) for certain Police Projects."

On motion of Alderman Cashin, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez, it was voted to approve the Resolutions.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 4 of the agenda:

CIP Budget Authorizations:

2001	220101	Tuberculosis Control - Revision #1
2002	215702	Refugee Tuberculosis Control
2002	411602	Great. Manchester Council Against Dom. & Sexual Violence
2002	411702	Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Cashin, it was voted to approve the CIP budget authorizations.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 5 of the agenda:

Communication from the Deputy Public Works Director submitting a request of the Fire Department for the disposition/transfer of four (4) vehicles.

Alderman Lopez asked do you want to get rid of them or transfer them.

Chief Kane answered we want to get rid of three and transfer one. What these are are vehicles that we replaced three or four years ago. We found that they were still on the Fire Department's inventory at City Hall and they have already been moved over to...one is at Parks & Recreation and the other three are up for auction down at the MTA. This happened a couple of years ago and it was just discovered this summer.

On motion of Alderman Cashin, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez, it was voted to approve the request.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 6 of the agenda:

Communication from the Security Manager providing additional information as requested by the committee for the utilization of funds for a requested transfer of \$15,048.00 from the 1999 CIP 333399 Card Access Security System Project to the 2000 CIP 831100 Security Project.

Alderman Lopez asked were these requested by the departments themselves. I guess I am interested in the Traffic Department. All of these years we didn't have anything and all of the sudden we are going to throw cameras in there?

Mr. Robidas answered this was a request that I had received from Mr. Lolicata back in December and we were looking at it for the 2002 fiscal year and then there were no monies available. When these monies became available, this project was inserted but this was a request that he had made probably eight months ago.

Alderman Lopez asked there is no other place in the City where this money can go that has cameras.

Mr. Robidas answered well it is the amount of money, Alderman, that actually he utilizes in that particular location. The amount of money that goes through that particular office throughout the year is a considerable amount and it is all loose

change. In addition, not only is it cameras but part of the system we are putting in is hold-up devices, etc. because there is no security. His last estimation was that there is at least \$750,000 a year that passes through that room and that is likely to increase with the civic center and the additional meters that are being placed throughout the downtown area. That is why he was looking for added security. He had also discussed with me, which does not appear on here because we have no funding available, but to increase security at the parking garages at night because there will be a substantial increase in revenue as well with the civic center activities and the additional rates. Specifically, we are looking at his agency right now to handle what is currently in there plus the additional fund that will be coming through. The Health Department, this is something that Mr. Rusczyk had asked me for about two years ago because he has some at risk people, which could place some of his people in jeopardy. In addition, there may be some items in there that may attract people after hours and the location of the facility was also a concern. Understanding and bearing in mind that there is a possibility that that office may relocate and/or consolidate, approximately 70% of the equipment that we will purchase will be transferable at the time. The Parks & Recreation Department request...this is a request that came in earlier this summer. That is based upon some vandalism they had, which was approximately \$25,000 at Crystal Lake. They had asked if there was something we could do at that particular facility. Coincidentally, it came in when this money was being discussed so we were able to insert that. That is an ongoing problem that Mr. Ludwig has had there for years. Again, this spring he said about \$20,000 to \$25,000 in damage was caused there.

Alderman Lopez moved to approve the request.

Alderman Cashin asked there is no one here from the Health Department. I am assuming that Fred knows about this and is agreeable to this?

Mr. Robidas answered each one of these, Alderman, has been discussed with the department head and they were involved with the estimate of the project and discussion of what we would be putting in for equipment.

Alderman Cashin stated well I talked to the School Department about some things you planned to do there and they told me they had never taken a vote on it and had not approved it and that is why I am a little bit reluctant.

Mr. Robidas replied I believe what you are speaking about is the card access control and that is actually something that goes back to the NORESCO contract that they had approved several years back. That was Phase II of the project so we were just continuing on a project that they had already approved approximately three years ago and that is something we had talked about.

Alderman Cashin responded well a vote was never taken. That is what they told me. I am not going to debate the issue with you.

Mr. Robidas replied well I believe Mr. Sheppard could address that. It was prior to my arrival that that was discussed. That was part of the NORESCO project and that was Phase II of the NORESCO project. That is something I believe that they voted on in 1998.

Alderman Cashin stated I am going to second this but from now on I would like some kind of a letter or document from each department head saying that they approved it before it comes to us.

Chairman O'Neil called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 7 of the agenda:

Discussion with the MTA General Manager relative to the placement of advertisements on bus shelters/benches and kiosks (wayfinding systems) in conjunction with the proposed "Street Furniture Program".

Chairman O'Neil stated just to set this up a little bit, Don Clay and I have had a couple of discussions about this and in your letter you talked about the advertising and making sure that everybody is on line. The second concern that I have is to make sure that all of the City departments are on line and you don't enter into a contract and have somebody throw you a curve ball later on this. Those are the two issues that I hope we discuss tonight.

Mr. Clay replied those are the two issues. The main issue right now with us is can we or can we not put advertising signs on our shelters and benches and stuff that we have around the City. I find no ordinance that says one way or the other, but if we go with this new program it will be a 15 year contract and we will need something that would say yes you can use the signs or have signage on your shelters and whatnot for that length of time.

Alderman Lopez asked what about restrictions on advertising. How are we going to limit the type of advertising such as beer and cigarettes? Has there been a restriction put on?

Mr. Clay answered under the Federal statute that we run under we can't do tobacco. We are not supposed to do hard liquor. We don't do anything with abortion stuff. That is all taboo and cannot be done.

Alderman Lopez asked do you think that we could have a complete list of that and what is not going to apply.

Mr. Clay answered I don't have one. I can see if I can get one from the company.

Alderman Lopez stated I am for this. I just want to make sure that we are not advertising something against our community and principles and the schools and stuff like that.

Mr. Clay replied we do have a say in what goes up there or should we say what doesn't go up there. If it is something that will be offensive to the community, to us or to the general public then we have the right to say no it can't go up there.

Alderman Lopez asked are we going to get the money or are you going to get the money.

Mr. Clay answered we are going to get the money.

Alderman Cashin asked when you say we, who is we. Is it the MTA? Is it the Board of Mayor and Aldermen? Who is it?

Mr. Clay asked on what part.

Alderman Cashin asked as far as the advertising goes. You said that if there was advertising that you people didn't approve of, you had the right to say no.

Mr. Clay answered it is the Transit Authority and I am sure that if the City objected to it, we would certainly make sure that it did not get put up.

Alderman Cashin replied I guess that is my question. Let's say that the Board of Mayor and Aldermen for whatever reason had objections to a piece of advertising and they called down and said look we would rather you didn't do this.

Mr. Clay responded we would make sure of what we were talking about and then we would advise them that we wouldn't want that up.

Alderman Lopez asked when this is done, you are going to enter into an agreement with somebody apparently.

Mr. Clay answered that is correct.

Alderman Lopez asked who is going to oversee the contract legally. Would it be Tom Clark or do you have an outside attorney?

Mr. Clay answered it would be our attorneys because this will be through the Transit Authority.

Alderman Lopez asked will he coordinate that through our attorney to make sure that the City is protected.

Mr. Clay answered if that is the wish of this Board we could certainly run that by the Solicitor.

Alderman Lopez asked, Tom, would that be appropriate.

Chairman O'Neil stated this really only needs to be here tonight as kind of a courtesy more than anything else. They really don't need formal approval by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen.

Mr. Clay replied for the shelters and benches I would agree with Alderman O'Neil. That is something that we have been doing right along. The advertisement is something that we have not done and there is nothing that I can find that says I can or I can't. I am just looking for some guidance one way or the other. Either we can or we can't.

Chairman O'Neil stated my understanding of it in discussions with you, Don, is that some other cities in the region have started similar programs. Lowell is one of them. So, this is something new in the transit...

Mr. Clay interjected it is not new in the transit business, it is just new to the Northeast. If I am not mistaken, the company that is going to do the advertisements is the same company that will be doing the advertising over at the civic center.

Alderman Shea stated you mentioned, Mr. Clay, that 10% would go to the MTA. Do you have any idea what that might be? Is it 10% of \$10 or 10% of \$500,000?

Mr. Clay replied I really cannot say. A lot depends on what they have for advertising, what they can sell and how many shelters are outfitted with this stuff. He could not give us any ballpark figure but what they will give us is an itemized account of all of the money that was taken in in a year.

Alderman Shea asked if that is somewhat substantial, will that subsidize the running of the MTA. If you were to get say \$80,000 or \$20,000 how would that...

Mr. Clay interjected our hopes are and we have talked a little bit about it with the commissioners but we are looking at maybe using this money to subsidize our CIP account so we could use that part...we get the 80% from the Feds for capital.

Alderman Shea asked so in other words it is to subsidize your regular operational program.

Mr. Clay answered that is correct.

Chairman O'Neil asked is it my understanding that it won't be a boilerplate. You could have a shelter on Elm Street that looks one way and you could go to another section of the City and it might be created a little differently to fit in with the neighborhood or...

Mr. Clay interjected that is correct to some degree. When we talked again with Culvert they were willing to maybe put two or possibly three different types of shelters in the City. They were really looking at two so we are probably looking at the downtown area to be a little different than the outlying areas.

Chairman O'Neil stated so this seems like a win-win.

Mr. Clay answered absolutely. They are going to buy them and install them and take care of them and insure them and clear the ice and snow. It is a win-win situation.

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Cashin, it was voted to approve the use of advertisements on bus shelters/benches and kiosks and have.

Chairman O'Neil stated we would just like to see whatever you can come up with with regards to the "don't" on advertising and I would like to see us on behalf of the Board to send a communication out to all departments asking if anyone has a problem with this so they don't enter into this contract and have somebody come back and say you have to go before the Zoning Board or your have to go before the Planning Board or the Highway Commissioners need to approve it or whatever it may be. Is that okay as part of that motion?

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 8 of the agenda:

Communication from the Director of Planning submitting a proposed policy regarding CIP procedures relative to requests for School projects.

Mr. Maranto stated I think this is pretty cut and dry. Bob has spoken to the School District. Ron Chapman had given us something previously, which we looked at and we came up with this draft right here that we have as a submission. It essentially indicates that they should basically comply with the CIP process so it will be consistent with our process and scheduling.

Chairman O'Neil stated my only concern is we seem to be limiting this to Public Works but what about other City agencies? Security Manager, Parks and Recreation, if Traffic does some signage for them?

Mr. Maranto replied I guess in the last sentence it talks about the Director of Public Works and we could put in "and other applicable departments as may be affected."

Chairman O'Neil stated I think it is important that there is a similar procedure for all departments. Any questions or comments from members of the Committee?

Alderman Lopez stated in reading this, are we bypassing the Joint School Committee. Is there going to be a delay there or is the School Board going to look at it and say let's send it over to the Building & Sites Committee? Are we going to have a delay in this process?

Mr. Maranto replied that is why I had here the word "timely manner." Whatever needs to be done has to be done on a schedule so it doesn't not slow down the CIP process at all.

Alderman Lopez stated the way it is now the School Board approves it along with Frank Thomas for priority projects. It goes to that Committee and during the course of the administrative portion there is always changes in everything. Am I reading this wrong that if there is one change it has to go before the School Board then?

Mr. Maranto replied I would think so.

Chairman O'Neil stated this came out of discussions during the CIP budget. When they presented their budget, there were some projects, which they said they voted on and there were other projects they said they didn't vote on. This was just, in my opinion, a process just to clear that up so that we don't do projects without School Board approval.

Mr. Maranto stated we also get two different requests. We get one from the Highway Department and we get one from the School District and this would consolidate the two.

Alderman Lopez replied just so I understand it though, when they do the priority and it requires a plan for alteration, change or remodeling of a school to be approved by the School Board, the School Board approves the priority A-Z and then the Site Committee takes over. You have two Aldermen on that Committee right and as the process goes...the way I read this if they make one change at the Site Committee it has to go back to the full School Board. Now you might have to wait a month and in some cases two months so aren't we being...I don't know it is a long process here to maybe wait for one change. It could be a minor change.

Chairman O'Neil stated again I go back to what I believe the intent of this was. If the School District or another City department presents something to the CIP Committee and there has been an actual vote of the Board of School Committee so that...and this comes into the chargeback issue and all of that so that they don't say later we never requested that. That is all this is going to do. This isn't to slow up the process as it has been going on now. All it is saying is the Board of School Committee has voted on this before it comes to the Board of Aldermen. We don't need to complicate it any more than that.

Alderman Lopez replied I don't want to complicate it. I just want to understand what is written here.

Mr. Sheppard stated basically this is formalizing what we do now. What we do now is sit down on a staff level with the School District and recommend some projects and they will bring in some projects and we will sit down and prioritize. Sometimes our priorities aren't necessarily the same as theirs. A school addition, for example, is not a priority for our Building Maintenance Division of the Highway Department so that may show up on their CIP but not on our CIP. We are looking at maintenance issues, but we sit down with staff beforehand. We develop our CIP requests and they develop their CIP requests, which over the past few years have been very similar to ours. We have worked very well with them. At that time, it is submitted to CIP and it goes to their Building & Sites Committee at the School Board and then it goes to the School Board and comes down to CIP and all of these projects are turned over to the Joint School Building Committee, which is the three Aldermen and the three School Board members.

Alderman Lopez asked so if there are any changes, does it still have to go back to the School Board.

Mr. Sheppard answered the way it works now is the Joint School Building Committee approves any changes in the contracts.

Alderman Lopez stated I understand what Alderman O'Neil is saying and I agree with what he is saying but I just want to make sure that this is worded right. Is it worded right so that some School Board member can't say you guys had no right to change that because of what you have written here? That is the only point I want to make.

Mr. Sheppard replied what they typically approve is say \$200,000 for a project and we stay within that \$200,000 even with change orders. If we needed say another \$50,000 for that typically we would go back to the Building & Sites Committee or the School District and get their approval to reallocate or to allocate an additional \$50,000 for that work so we do go back to the School District if we need more money for that project meaning above what was originally allocated. It took us a long time to come up with this process.

Alderman Lopez asked if you agree with that then I don't have any problems as long as we understand that if the Joint School Building Committee does something that their hands are not tied.

Chairman O'Neil answered again that is not the intent of this in my eyes. The intent is if the Highway Department decides on their own we are going to pave all of the parking lots at the high school and then later they do a chargeback to the School District and the School District says we never approved that, that is what this would prevent. If any work is going to go on at some point it needs to be approved by the School District. We want to add that change on the bottom to address any City departments.

Mr. Maranto replied correct.

On motion of Alderman Cashin, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez, it was voted approve the policy for CIP procedures relative to School project requests.

TABLED ITEMS

9. Copy of a communication from the Deputy Finance Officer to Alderman Gatsas relative to funding options for Millyard parking facilities.

This item remained on the table.

10. Ordinance Amendment:

"Amending Section 37.03 "Advisory Board" by inserting new language prohibiting persons holding positions within the entity

association, or organization designated by the Advisory Board to manage services within the Central Business Service District from serving as members of the Advisory Board."

This item remained on the table.

11. Communication from the Director of Planning submitting a copy of a contractor's estimate in the amount of \$152,750 to make repairs to the Blood Mausoleum.

This item remained on the table.

12. Communication from Robert S. MacKenzie submitting updated information on HOME projects under Manchester Neighborhood Housing Services as requested by the CIP Committee.

This item remained on the table.

There being no further business, on motion of Alderman Cashin, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee